

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-10 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of their subject matter. Claims 11-23 are new, with claims 11 and 20 being independent claims. Support for the new claims is provided in the filed application.

As the total number of pending claims and the number of independent claims does not exceed twenty and three, respectively, Applicants submit that no fees for the claims of the present amendment are due.

Amendment to the Specification

The amendment to the specification is offered to address a common European practice, which is not practiced in the U.S. Specifically, reference to the specific claims is deleted from the specification. No new matter is added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of *Naden* (US Patent 7,057,635). While the rejected claims are cancelled rendering this rejection moot, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11-23 are patentable over the applied art.

At the outset Applicants rely at least on the following standards with regard to proper rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Notably, a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. *See, e.g., W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Anticipation requires that each and every element of the claimed invention be disclosed in a single prior art reference. *See, e.g., In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 31 USPQ2d 1671 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Alternatively, anticipation requires that each and every element of the claimed invention be embodied in a single prior art device or practice. *See, e.g., Minnesota Min. & Mfg. Co. v. Johnson & Johnson Orthopaedics*,

Inc., 976 F.2d 1559, 24 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1992). For anticipation, there must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention. *See, e.g., Scripps Clinic & Res. Found. v. Genentech, Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565, 18 USPQ2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Claim 1 is drawn to a system for giving a presentation. The system features:

“...an internal communication network adapted for access by a device, but not adapted for access by a wireless device;

an image-showing device comprising a wireless communication interface, the wireless device being adapted to make an ad-hoc wireless connection to the image-showing device...”

Claim 20, drawn to a method includes similar features.

As described in the filed application, the system allows access to an image-showing device (e.g., a projector) to both internal users and external users. The internal users may access the image-showing device via an internal network. The access may be wired or wireless. However, the non-internal users cannot access the internal network and access the image-showing device via a direct wireless connection. (Kindly refer to Figs. 1-4 and supporting description thereof in the filed application.)

By contrast, the reference to *Naden* discloses access to a projector via a transceiver 8 for PDAs 4a-4C. A wireline connection 8 provides access to an external network such as a WAN or LAN. There is however no disclosure in the applied art of a wireless link for (external) wireless devices to the image –showing device; and for access to an internal network by a device, but not to the wireless device in the manner set forth in claims 11 and 20.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 20 are patentable over the applied art. Accordingly, claims 12-19 and 21-23, which depend from claims 11 and 20, are also patentable for at least the same reasons.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The rejections of dependent claims 3-6, 8 and 10 have also been considered, but are moot in view of the present amendment. To the extent that new dependent claims include similar subject matter, Applicant again submit that these independent claims are patentable over the applied art for at least the same reasons as claims 11 and 20.

Conclusion

In view the foregoing, applicant(s) respectfully request(s) that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 50-0238 for any additional fees, including, but not limited to, the fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17.

If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of:
Phillips Electronics North America Corp.



by: William S. Francos (Reg. No. 38,456)

Date: May 9, 2007

Volentine Francos & Whitt, PLLC
Two Meridian Blvd.
Wyomissing, PA 19610
(610) 375-3513 (v)
(610) 375-3277 (f)